DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 580 JC 780 424

AUTHOR Scigliano, Virginia S.; And Others
TITLE A Close Encounter: A Report of a National Charette on Community Colleges and Community Schools.
INSTITUTION Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Community Education; Community Services; *Cooperative Planning; Delivery Systems; Educational Needs; Educational Problems; Guidelines; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Junior Colleges; *Models; Needs Assessment; *School Community Cooperation
IDENTIFIERS *Charettes

ABSTRACT

This monograph discusses a model, developed by conference participants using the Charette process, for facilitating the delivery of human services through the cooperative partnership of community schools, colleges, and agencies. The model is based on the premise that limited community resources require elimination of competitive systems, duplication of effort, and disorganized delivery systems in order to better provide for clients and make human services accessible and their delivery effective. Cooperative comprehensive planning would assure maximum utilization and accessibility of common resources. The model calls for identification of services through needs assessment, improved communication among institutions, agencies and community members, improved selection procedures and pre- and in-service training programs for education personnel, and development of a system for monitoring, evaluating, and improving services. The model also reviews the educational programs, facilities, services, and service populations that reflect the scope of the cooperative program, as well as a seven-step process for promoting cooperative administration efforts. Barriers to full implementation of a community education program and strategies for overcoming these barriers are suggested. (TR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157580

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Virginia S. Scigliano

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A CLOSE ENCOUNTER

A Report of a National

Charette on Community

Colleges and Community Schools

July 1978

Sponsored by:

The Laboratory for Community-Based Education

Center for Higher Education

Nova University

Fort Lauderdale, Florida

JC 780 424

Editorial Staff

Virginia S. Scigliano, Conference Director

Eugene E. DuBois

James F. Gollattscheck

Ervin Harlacher

John A. Scigliano

Published by:
Nova/NYIT University Press
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

CHARETTE CONSULTANTS

Dr. Donald Mackenzie
Associate Director
Center for Community Education
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

Dr. James F. Gollattscheck
President
Valencia Community College
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, Florida 32802

Ms. Suzanne Fletcher, Director
Center for Community Education
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
One DuPont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Ervin Harlacher
Chancellor
The Metropolitan Community Colleges
560 Westport Road
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

Dr. Marvin Weiss
Dean of Community Services and Community Education
Clackamas Community College
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dr. Virginia S. Scigliano
Director
Nova University at Coral Springs
3300 University Drive
Coral Springs, Florida 33065

Dr. Eugene DuBois
National Education Professor
Institute for Higher Education
Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

CHARETTE PARTICIPANTS

Dr. James F. Gollattscheck
President
Valencia Community College
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, Florida 32802

Dr. Donald MacKenzie
Associate Director
Center for Community Education
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

Ms. Suzanne Fletcher
Director
Center for Community Education
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
One DuPont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dr. Ervin Harlacher
Chancellor
The Metropolitan Community Colleges
560 Westport Road
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

Dr. Marvin Weiss
Dean of Community Services and Community Education
Clackamas Community College
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dr. Virginia S. Scigliano
Director
Nova University at Coral Springs
3300 University Drive
Coral Springs, Florida 33065

Dr. Eugene DuBois
National Education Professor
Institute for Higher Education
Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

CHARETTE PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Augustus "Skip" Little
Associate Director
Center for Community Education
University of Florida
Norman Hall, Room 124
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Mr. Carlo Simeoli
Dean of Continuing Education and
Community Services
St. Louis Community College at
Florissant Valley
3400 Pershall Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63135

Mr. Philip Regensdorf
Assistant Director
Adult and Community Education
Broward County Florida
1350 S. W. 2nd Court
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33312

Mrs. Barbara Brandon
Executive Assistant to the Regional
Commissioner
U. S. Office of Education
Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007

Mr. Linwood Powell
Associate Dean of Instruction for
Occupational Programs
Fayetteville Technical Institute
P.O. Box 35236
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28303

Mr. Kenneth D. Futch, Jr.
Dean of Continuing Education
Cape Fear Technical Institute
411 North Front Street
Wilmington, North Carolina 28401

Mr. Calvin Burke
Director of Continuing Education and
Community Services
North Arkansas Community College
Pioneer Ridge
Harrison, Arkansas 72601

Ms. Donna Grady
Director
Counseling and Job Placement
for the Elderly Program
Broward Community College
1525 South Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Ms. Zolla Benedico
Chairperson
Continuing Education
Miami-Dade Community College
New World Center Campus
300 N. E. 2nd Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

Dr. Charles Barrett
Associate Vice-President
North Carolina Department of
Community Colleges
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Mr. John Stanley
Director of Evening Programs
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville
11901 Beach Boulevard
Jacksonville, Florida 32216

Dr. Paul Kinser
Director of Continuing Education
Valencia Community College
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, Florida 32802

Dr. Betty Ann Metz
Dean of Continuing Education and
Community Services
Bristol Community College
Fall River, Massachusetts

Dr. David Groth
Vice-President of Academic Affairs
Broward Community College
225 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

Mr. Hal Blitman
Coordinator of Community Services
Broward Community College
South Campus
7100 Hollywood Boulevard
Hollywood, Florida 33021

Ms. Sandy Brown
Coordinator of Community Services
Broward Community College
Central Campus
3501 S. W. Davie Road
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

FOREWORD

Nova University at Coral Springs is a community-based education center of Nova University, located in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Through the Laboratory for Community-Based Education, a unit of the Center for Higher Education, various models for community-based education are designed, developed, implemented and evaluated. The philosophy of the Laboratory staff stems from a belief that governmental agencies, public schools, private and public institutions of higher education have potential for making a greater impact on their own communities when they utilize cooperative planning techniques in the development of programs and activities. The establishment and maintenance of links between social agencies, educational institutions and other community resources enable educational practitioners to have a far greater impact on community directions than if they were to operate in isolation.

In keeping with this mission, the Laboratory was established at the Coral Springs Center in October 1976, and has initiated community-based activities with proprietary, county, state and private non-profit agencies. One of these activities was a national conference developed for community school and community college personnel. Its theme concerned communication between community colleges and community schools. It was held July 28-29, 1977 in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. The conference was the first in a series that has been designed to develop useful products. A group of professionals met for the two days and through the Charette Process, produced materials

that should prove useful to other practitioners in community education. This monograph is the result of the efforts and contributions of participants. Each person who participated should share equally in the credit for the publication of this monograph.

INTRODUCTION

This monograph is in actuality a report of an experience. The persons listed were participants in this experience and attempted to create a structure for cooperative relationships in community education. Therefore, this report in monograph form may not represent the traditional results of a scholarly meeting. What it does report, is the results of scholars utilizing a non-traditional form of organizing ideas, research, and experiences. The monograph is just one of the approaches Nova University utilizes in expanding interesting and innovative techniques that bring about social and educational change.

The Charette method is a new approach to problem solving, and thus, does not conform to traditional scholarly reporting. The results of this Charette will be criticized, as they should. However, the critic should bear in mind, that there are few, if any models, for this type of endeavor.

What is presented here, is the collective thinking of serious scholars of higher education and community education; ideas and program analyses are presented as they were formulated during the conference. It is expected that this monograph will produce two significant results:

1. Greater cooperative endeavors between community colleges and community schools.

2. Consistent and standard formats for the reporting of Charette experiences.

The publication of this monograph is just one attempt by Nova University to expand its contribution to the field of higher education.

THE CHARETTE

Traditionally the Charette has been known as an architectural planning process and has recently been adopted for use as a group administrative tool to facilitate discussion and synthesis. The ideas generated by participants result in a formal document that contains a summary of the activities and findings of the Charette. The process is best utilized with experienced practitioners and consultants selected for their skills in facilitating group effectiveness.

Historically, Charette means "cart" and is a word that was used to describe a process whereby the young student architects and artists would put their drawings on carts and take them through the streets of Paris, getting comments as they went along. They would then come together in a courtyard and criticize each other's work. Under the pressure of rapid-fire criticism they finalized their drawings and produced the very best product possible. A Charette is a structured brainstorming type event with deadlines, problem-solving strategies and a final product.

The Charette was selected as the vehicle for the conference in community college and community school communication because of the product orientation of its design.

THE CONFERENCE

The national conference, held at the Hilton Hotel, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, July 28-29, 1977 was designed to produce a monograph for establishing communication linkages between community colleges and community schools. The participants acquired a basic introduction to the Charette process and produced the model that follows.

The monograph is dedicated to practitioners who are genuinely interested in developing sound models for cooperative communication between community colleges and community schools. The monograph was published by the Laboratory For Community-Based Education, a unit of the Center for Higher Education at Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

THE SESSIONS

The conference began with a review of the Charette process by Ervin Harlacher. He stressed that the success of the conference was contingent on the group's concensus about the conference mission.

> "It is essential that all agree in the beginning on the mission, what we are all about, what we are going to accomplish and what we are going to end up with by the closing session. These are given and participants cannot deviate from the goal to produce a written product. To do this, all participants must function as equals and we start by agreeing to a unified mission statement."

Each group was assigned a group leader and a group synthesizer. The role of the group leader was to keep the group on target, plant seeds (ideas), and keep the group moving but without dominating the group. The synthesizer's role was to reflect on group comments and to bring the discussion to a point of focus. This person ensured that the group had something to report at the end of the group discussion.

Reporters communicated the group results to the combined conference groups at a joint session. Each report was juried and criticized by selected participant jurors. Finally, conflicting group reports were reconciled by special sub-groups.

Each group was required to adhere to explicit time frames. The fast tempo forced individuals to move forward. After approximately one hour the groups discussed, juried and reached concensus on the following mission.

MISSION

The participants agreed to the following conference mission as necessary for the development of the community college/community school model: To develop a viable model for facilitating the delivery of human services through the cooperative partnership of community schools, community colleges and other community agencies. This process was to be written and made suitable for dissemination to interested communities, both educational and of general purpose. The components of the model and process included, but were not limited to, a consideration of the following:

1. Philosophy
2. Rationale
3. Goal
4. Objectives
5. Role and scope
6. Administration and organization
7. Barriers to Full Implementation
8. Strategies For Overcoming Barriers

THE MODEL

Philosophy

The community approach to education is the process which seeks to involve all the members of a community. It provides an effective mechanism for this on-going citizen involvement which stresses inter-institutional and inter-agency cooperation through efficient and effective utilization of human, physical and financial resources. It recognizes that learning is life-long.

Rationale

The limitation of resources in any community makes it essential to eliminate competitive systems,duplication of effort and disorganized delivery systems to provide for unserved clients or better to provide for those clients already served. All human services must be made accessible and effectively delivered. A cooperative venture of comprehensive planning would assure maximum utilization and accessibility of common resources.

An acceptance of the above philosophy and rationale led to the specific adoption of the following broad goal and objective statements.

Goal

To improve the scope, quality, accessibility and delivery of services to all members of the community.

Objectives

1. Identify services through a needs assessment and eliminate undesirable duplication of services.
2. Promote efficient and effective utilization and sharing of community resources (physical, financial and human).
3. Improve communication among educational institutions, community agencies and members.
4. Insure quality community educational personnel by:
   a) Improving selection procedures.
   b) Providing both pre-service and in-service training programs.
5. Develop a system of monitoring, evaluation and refinement of services.

Recommendations

The new community unit should:

1. Clearly define its mission and objectives and develop an understandable rationale.
2. Design a blueprint for action wherein all parties of the partnership clearly understand their roles.
3. Design delivery systems to meet the needs of all who reside within the community.

After delineating objectives, the participants focused on possible role and scope of cooperative activities.

Role and Scope

The role is to meet the needs of the community through educational programs that are efficient and effective in the utilization of community facilities as well as the coordination, facilitation and/or provision of social services. The translation of this role into action will be determined by the total needs of the community. The following dimensions reflect the scope of the education program and community services that could be offered and the facilities that could be utilized.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

- K-12
- ABE
- GED
- Vo-Tech (credit/ non-credit)
- Academic (credit/ non-credit)
- General Education
- Americanization, etc.
- Recreational
- Special Education
- Universities
- Extended Day (Alternative schools)
- Testing Centers

FACILITIES

- Community College & Technical Institute Campuses
- High School Buildings/Private Schools
- YMCA's/YWCA's
- Churches
- Auditoriums
- Health Facilities
- Nursing Homes
- Day Care
- Sheltered Workshops
- Homes
- Industry/Business
- Libraries, etc.
- Civic Centers, etc.

SERVICES

Transportation
Advocacy
Physical & Mental Health
Recreation
Alcoholics Anonymous
Counseling-Human Relations
Brokering (Referral)
Public Information
Child Care (Day Care) - Parenting
Hope Lines
Older Adult Care
Legal Advice
Consumer
Safety
Environment
Cultural Enrichment, etc.

The scope of this cooperative venture is indicated by the realization that efforts are directed toward the entire community. The following are examples of groups in the community that could be included:

Elderly
Migrants
Physically & Mentally Handicapped
Families
Military Personnel
Inmates
Immigrants
Racial Minorities
Women
Youth
Gifted
Businessmen from Small Businesses

Recommendations

These statements and listings are necessarily broad or generalized, and it is imperative that they be locally determined for each target community through comprehensive programs of assessment of needs, survey of facilities and inventory of resources.

Administration and Organization

There is a need to develop a model for administration and organization for the delivery of services in a cooperative manner. This model should be developed to include an assessment of:

1. Needs
2. Resources
3. Policies
4. Facilities
5. Funding

Cooperation in these dimensions is vital to most effectively and efficiently meet the needs of the community, and to promote the concept of community-based education. To create this cooperative approach it is necessary to cause a catalytic action which will result in this cooperative effort. The following steps might be appropriate to achieve the desired results:

Step 1. Formation of an ad hoc committee/ task force to serve as initiators of change, survey the needs, assess available resources, analyze the power structures, communicate the need for change, etc.

Step 2 Adoption by appropriate Boards/ agencies of principles, goals, objectives and plans as identified by the ad hoc task force. The direction is sanctioned by proper authorities.

Step 3. Creation, change or modification of appropriate administrative structure in community college, public schools and other agencies.

Step 4. Formation of board based advisory council consisting of key decision makers or leaders to give policy level advice.

Step 5. Creation of a Coordinating Board to recommend policy, budget, structure decisions for the cooperative effort. The Coordinating Board would consist of top level decision makers (superintendents, presidents, and their representatives and heads of other agencies).

Step 6. Creation of a Coordinating Council consisting of professional staff responsible for implementation of delivery systems, development of operating procedures, and operational problem-solving.

Step 7. Creation of an advisory committee structure which would provide guidance to professional staff. This structure may include an overall advisory council of representatives from various agencies, or individual advisory councils for unique programs, or advisory councils for individual schools or any combination thereof. This structure should be appropriate to the particular situation.

Step 8. Creation or modification of delivery systems to provide for utilization of human, physical and financial resources to provide effective and efficient delivery of human services.

Step 9. Establish an on-going process for review evaluation and modification of the system.

Participants felt that these steps could not be taken without a consideration of potential barriers.

Barriers to Full Implementation

Participants identified barriers to full implementation of the community-based philosophy in five major categories. These follow:

1. Lack of commitment and support for community education, especially for long-term programs.
   a. Lack of common terminology.
   b. Traditional lock-step educational theory and lack of acceptance of the community education concept.
   c. Lack of understanding of the cooperative concept by administration, faculty and classified staff.
   d. Inability to articulate and document the advantages of cooperation.
2. Vested Interests
   a. General resistance to change from the traditional mechanisms to new concepts.
   b. Fear of loss of power, and fragmentation of authority.
   c. Mistrust of staff as to quality of instruction
   d. Feelings of ownership of facilities become an obstacle of sharing.
3. Legislative mandates:
   a. Competition for funds
   b. Funding formulas: Public School vs. Community College.

c. Accreditation and credentials

d. Prohibitions and restrictions

e. Lack of support from higher authorities.

4. The Program Itself

a. Program visibility

b. Accessibility

c. Cost of services or programs

d. Misunderstanding of programs

e. Lack of relevancy of program to community needs.

f. Lack of relevancy as seen by program participants.

g. Lack of availability of counseling.

h. Bureaucratic red-tape.

i. Fear of institutions by participant.

j. Inappropriately trained staff and institution.

k. Institutional descrimination.

5. Others

a. Lack of effective communication by the media-misquotes.

b. Geographical location of offices.

c. Bias and discrimination: administration, staff, public, media, etc.

A sophisticated effort will consider mechanisms for identifying and develop strategies for overcoming these barriers.

Strategies for Overcoming Barriers

Although barriers can block the implementation of cooperative programs, the participants stressed strategies that could be utilized to confront such problems.

1. Sell ideas to state, educational unit (community school) and community.

A. Awareness Campaign

1. Document success of cooperation in education.
2. Synthesize terminology in the field.
3. Promote seminars, workshops, and charettes that addressed topics of community-based education.
   a. Use understandable brochures.
   b. Disseminate information broadly.

B. Human Relations Skills Development

1. Citation of successful cooperatives.
2. Involve administrations and staffs in more joint ventures.
3. Involve groups on a social basis.
4. Promote understanding of common purpose.

C. Implement a state funding formula which rewards effective, efficient, cooperative use of community resources.

SUMMARY

We have deliberately tried to suggest a model with wide applicability. What we have is a beginning. It consists of suggestions and activities. We hope others will try some of these and consequently force a change in the status quo. This is not the model for any particular community college or community school. It is just a process which needs to be modified, revised and tested whenever cooperative programs are started.

This is not a model that you can take off the shelf and run with because that could be disastrous. The appropriate process model for any given situation must be shaped by the people that must drive it using concepts such as those given in this monograph. All agencies must remember, however, that when you give somewhere you will also receive. It is a win idea. You cannot expect to receive and not be giving. If schools and colleges would reach out to one more agency than they do now, the cooperative spirit will flourish. At least they can take an idea to one or two new individuals in those agencies. The first real problem that faces all educators is to make a good beginning, and as they take the initiative they

should be prepared to compromise. The best place to start in community cooperative ventures is with people known personally by members of the staff as creative and innovative people. Educational Institutions cannot start with the impossible mission of changing people and groups that are impossible to change.

The participants concluded with the following suggestions for practitioners:

1. Do not start with a boulder - start with a pebble.
2. Build a process that can be utilized as widely as possible.
3. Any new model needs extensive evaluation.
4. Build into the process a mechanism for reaching at least one new agency.
5. The process should identify at least one or two new problem areas.

State of the art in communication and cooperation between community schools and community colleges.

The phrase community-based education is a relatively new one on the scene of higher education. Educators are just beginning to make it more than a phrase and starting to find ways that the community-based idea can be implemented. The community-based education label is used more and more frequently by institutions with the capability of being responsive and reflective of their surrounding communities. This also just happens to be the essence of all community education.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 1 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES